DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 040 985 TE 001 703

AUTHOR Gowin, D. B.; Strzepek, J.
TITLE The Far Side of Paradigms: Conditions for Knowledge-Making in English Education.
INSTITUTION New York State English Council, Oswego.
PUB DATE Oct 69
NOTE 17p.
JOURNAL CIT English Record; v20 n1 p7-22 Oct 1969

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.95
DESCRIPTORS Concept Formation, Conceptual Schemes, Cultural Background, *Educational Research, Educational Theories, *English Education, Evaluation Criteria, Fundamental Concepts, Intellectual Disciplines, Literary Analysis, *Literature, Methods Research, *Models, Problem Solving, Research Design, *Research Methodology, Values

ABSTRACT

N. L. Gage's analysis of the educational research paradigm can be modified and expanded--first in a Model of the Structure of Knowledge (SOK) and then in a SOK Module which concretely demonstrates one approach to knowledge-making in English Education. Categories in the SOK Model would include (1) the Context of Inquiry--the milieu, the phenomena to be studied, the assumptions and presuppositions upon which the claims rest, the "telling" questions which unlock inquiry, the principle of evidence used to select and interpret data, and key concepts and conceptual systems which pattern facts and ideas; (2) Methods of Work--procedural commitments, techniques, and the need to adapt them to the stubbornness of the subject matter; (3) Products and Productions--selected facts, interpretations, analyses, and completed studies in the field of English education; and (4) Values--deliberated interests both within and outside the field. Based on these categories, a SOK Module can be developed, for example, to teach literature using the pragmatic (audience-oriented) point of view. The SOK Model can help English educators improve the production of both theoretical and applied knowledge in the middle ground between scholars and teachers. (JB)

FD040985

English Record; Vol. 20, No. 1, October 1969

THE FAR SIDE OF PARADIGMS: CONDITIONS FOR KNOWLEDGE-MAKING IN ENGLISH EDUCATION

D. B. Gowin and J. Strzepek

Making knowledge in any field is typically thought of as an empirical research endeavor. In empirical science the notion of a paradigm has recently been used to denote two different meanings. One meaning of paradigm refers to the general history and tradition of the patterns of research in a field, including the theories and conceptual systems, the chief commitment to methods and techniques, the social patterns of association into Societies, Professional Organizations, Journals (and their editorial policies), and the informal patterns of communication between workers in the field. In short, a paradigm in this sense includes the most important conditions of work and life of the members of the field. The second meaning of paradigm is simply that of an exemplar case, a clear instance, a model example. Thus a paradigm of evolutionary biological research would be the facts about the change in color from white to dark in the lunar moth as it adapted to the soot of industrial cities. A paradigm in psychology would be the study of children's intelligence using IQ tests as instruments of science.

Professor N. L. Gage published an article some years ago with the title, "This Side of Paradigms," a review of empirical research on English teaching.[1] Gage believes that critical examination of paradigms, as approaches to research, is called for in educational research, and specifically research on teaching English. To organize his analysis he separates three aspects of the research paradigm: the substantive, the methodological, and the logistical. By substantive, Gage means the basic concerns of research on teaching, such as concern with methods of teaching. This category of the substantive also is further analyzed into concepts, variables (both educational and psychological for Gage), and the way the infinite variety of phenomena is selected, abstracted and focused by the research workers. We wish to call this area the Context for Inquiry, both to broaden Gage's category and to permit a more precise rendering of what must necessarily be thought about within the Context for Inquiry.

A second category Gage names the "methodological," by which

D. B. Gowin is Associate Professor of Education at Cornell University; J. Strzepek, Instructor of Education at Stanford University.

TE001103

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

he means ways of measuring variables, different tests and statistical methods, techniques for collecting and analyzing data. Here again we need to broaden this category in order to make necessary distinctions. We prefer to call it Methods of Work because we reserve the term "methodological" for the *study* of methods. If we were really to study methods of research we would include many more methods than Gage, with his necessarily limited empirical view, would include. This more inclusive study is well worth doing, particularly in fields where limited empirical methods have produced so little illumination.

Gage's third category is the "logistical," by which he means the whole host of concerns with men and money, organization and administration, and the like, that are necessary in planning, executing, interpreting, communicating, applying, and improving research. Our reason for wanting to cite Gage's three categories is to affirm the third as important, but not a topic for this paper, and to discuss and extend the first two as important considerations in talking about the conditions for knowledge-making in English education. We consider this problem one in the studies of the structure of knowledge (SOK), and we will present a SOK Model, a set of abstract relations which pertain to any field. We will also present a SOK Module, an attempt to give one example within English Education.

* * *

The structure of knowledge in a field of study may be broadly characterized by its telling questions, its key concepts and conceptual systems, its reliable and relevant methods of work, its central and common products, and its internal and external values. We also need to know the Scene; that is, in some fundamentally characteristic sense, the phenomena the field deals with, the occasions which give rise to the quest for knowledge, and the portion of human experience illuminated by the knowledge claims produced by the workers in the field. We will discuss the SOK Model in four parts—Context for Inquiry, Methods, Products and Values—with most emphasis on the first two parts.

SOK Model

Description of the Context for Inquiry:

The context for inquiry includes the scene, the phenomena of interest, the basic assumptions and presuppositions, the telling questions, and the principle of evidence. By "scene" we mean the most inclusive frame of reference, or background, in which the phenomena of interest can stand out clearly. Any research is an abstraction and selection from an almost infinite variety of

possible things one might study, as Gage correctly sees, but we also need to be able to describe in some evocative fashion the context or scene from which a particular study emerges. Such descriptions can call our attention to the basic assumptions and presuppositions of the field, i.e., those ideas taken for granted in order to establish meaningful communication. What is taken for granted, or assumed, in one study may become the object of inquiry in another study, but the second study will require a set of assumptions as well. A presupposition is a necessary antecedent assumption, as it were, an assumption of an assumption, and the delineation of presuppositions in any field is basic philosophical work. Any set of knowledge claims rests upon both assumptions and presuppositions.

Within the Context for Inquiry may be detected a Sense of Approach to the phenomena. The Sense of Approach is revealed by the sorts of Telling Questions which can be asked of the phenomena of interest. A fool can ask more questions than seven wise men can answer, but a telling question is one which "tells" on the phenomena and unblocks inquiry. Telling questions are extremely valuable nuggets in the knowledge search. They help convert what is benumbingly puzzling about a situation into something that can be thought about intelligently. In Deweyan language, they help convert an indeterminate situation into a problematic situation. Telling questions are often formulated with the help of the most generative ideas in a field. Different fields differ in the questions they ask and the kinds of facts they seek to help answer the questions. Schwab supplies a metaphysical speculation that perhaps the realities vary. He notes that the persistent and rewarding differences among sciences encourages a conviction that there are real and genuine differences among different bodies of phenomena. Differences in questions put and data sought are not merely the products of historical habits among the practitioners of the science, but also reflect some actual stubbornnesses of the subject matters.[2] Whether nature is a seamless web, a harmonious unity in which everything correlates with everything else, or whether nature is divinely diverse and richly pluralistic—a problem of the one and the many—perhaps cannot be decided scientifically but must be catalogued among the philosophical presuppositions of knowledge-makers.

Another aspect of the Sense of Approach is the Principle of Evidence by which one decides what is to count as relevant evidence and what is to be rejected. Until an example of an acceptable answer to a question is forthcoming, any question

remains ambiguous, several different answers being possible. The context helps to relate question to acceptable answer by suggesting relevant criteria for judging. The principle of evidence works at two places: in the selection of facts which will be admitted as data; and in the interpretation of data.

Finally, the Context for Inquiry includes the key concepts and conceptual systems. It seems impossible to ask a truly telling question without some sort of fairly clear concepts. To begin an inquiry is, as Schwab has noted, to admit that in some sense you are ignorant of the requisite knowledge. The key concepts work to guide the inquiry, to sort out in dim light useful questions and possible answers. The way concepts give facts meaning is a most important and disputed epistemological problem. Without arguing the issue, it does seem that facts without concepts are blind and concepts without facts are empty (apologies to Kant). We must briefly indicate the meanings we attach to these pesky elements of the structure of knowledge, concepts and facts.

Definitions of Concept and Fact:

Much has been written recently in education about the use of concepts to give order and structure to knowledge, but little has been done to clarify the meaning of "concept." Clarification is difficult since it presupposes a theory of meaning, another sticky thicket.

We first note that a sign is something which stands for something else. If we say that A stands for B, we can say A means B. We can say smoke is a sign of fire; a cloud is a sign of rain; a + is a sign of addition; we have both natural and artificial (conventional) signs. Concept is defined as a sign of a commonality in a variety of situations which permits a stable response. The concept of liquid points to common qualities of milk, oil, water, while ignoring the many differences between them. And we think a child has the concept of liquid when he correctly sorts out examples.

Concepts are triadic. Concepts stand for the relations between (1) the sign, (2) the stable response, and (3) the commonality. Much qualification is necessary to make this abstract formula fit different situations. A lot depends on whether we are putting an emphasis upon the conventional signs or the natural signs of phenomena. The invented signs and symbols of studies like symbolic logic or mathematics generate further qualifications. For our purposes here, we will stipulate that concepts are signs (largely conventional and linguistic) which permit a stable response to a feature common to a variety of situa-

tions. The stable response has to do with psychosocial variables. The commonality in situations may range over simple similarity to regularity to invariance.

A conceptual system is a set of logically related concepts, usually permitting a pattern of reasoning in relating one concept to another. We sometimes speak loosely of a network of ideas, as in ideologies, theories, models, philosophies.

The explication of the meaning of "fact" also requires distinctions and qualifications. We have found the following three distinctions useful. Fact in the first sense means either an event which just naturally occurs, or a happening done under the control of a human agent. So we could speak of death by natural processes or by suicide or murder. This first sense of fact suggests fact as *factum,* something done. Fact in the second sense refers to the record of the event or doing. Any event which leaves no record or residue simply passes away and is no longer a candidate for study. Scientists and other knowledge-makers spend a lot of time thinking about techniques for making records. A good device for recording events generates an index to the phenomena of interest. Sometimes records of events are not artificially made but just naturally occur, such as the erosion of stone steps or the accretion of bones in elephant graveyards. Historians typically study the residues of the past which are present today—the documents, coins, diaries, films—and the experimental scientists typically invent new ways of making records of events now happening (often events they make occur). Facts in the third sense consist of statements, typically verbal propositions, which are based upon the records of the events occurring in the phenomena of interest. Much of academic scholarship utilizing facts works with facts in this third sense; that is, statements of facts. Critical examination of statements of facts seems easier than critical examination of the records which is still easier than critical examination of the relation between events and the records of events. The existence of these three levels or meanings of fact points both to a piece of the structure of knowledge and to a way disciplines differ in their structure. Ask yourself what a poetic fact is. Is it an event, a human doing, a record, or a statement? All of these in different ways?

Concepts and facts are related, as suggested earlier. If concepts are signs of commonalities in situations, the situations and commonalities may vary as the meaning of fact varies. That is, the concept may point to common features in events and human doings, to regularities within the record itself, and to similarities in factual statements. A concept is a sign which may stand for (1) event, doing, (2) record, or (3) statement.

These distinctions, always in need of examples and the qualifications of purpose and context, make up that part of the structure of knowledge we have called the Context for Inquiry. It may be noted now that we are assuming that inquiry is a broader term than research, an assumption of great importance in fields like English and English Education. We are also assuming that knowledge is man-made, and we next turn to a discussion of Methods of Work.

SOK Model (Part Two)
Methods of Work: Methods, Techniques, Methodology:

A method is a procedural commitment. Methods are collections of techniques or ways of doing things that may be generalized or made common to a variety of situations. Methods involve regular steps, planned sequences, ordered phases, related stages. Methods are of many kinds: experimental, empirical, historical, pedagogical, comparative, conceptual.

Techniques of work are the many diifferent specific ways of working.

Methodology, as we have suggested, is the study of methods and techniques. Such study looks for assumptions and presuppositions underlying procedures, cites reasons for the limitations and resources of different ways of working, suggests unanticipated consequences of the uses of methods.

Some researchers of English teaching methods, Gage notes, make the assumption that what a teacher does following one method of teaching makes a difference over a broad range of topics (punctuation, capitalization, paragraphing, organization, style) and wide variety of students (bright, dull; secure, insecure; middle class, lower class). Since these studies have seldom yielded big differences, Gage suggest that we need "more complex multivariate experimental designs that would reveal the significant interactions between teaching methods, subject-matter components, pupil characteristics, and concomitant experiences." Gage, op. cit., p. 10. We agree with Gage here, as he picks out the key educational variables of teacher, subject matter, learner and social setting, but call attention to his assumption that methods of research must be *one* form of experimental method. It is our conviction that English Education will need to adopt and adapt methods of work which are closely related to the phenomena of interest as determined by the subject matter of the field.

The users of experimental methods tend to seek phenomena

and data that can be quantified rather than identified qualitatively; the desire for generalization tends to obscure exceptions and uniqueness. A case history of how one student comes to understand one poem may be a most illuminating piece of research.

English scholarship, in particular literary criticism, supports a method of work which is conceptual. We believe conceptual methods of research are most useful, reliable and important to English Education. The conceptual method used by critics of literature involves asking a coherent set of questions about a specific work (or set of works) and seeking answers either within the work itself or from elements closely associated with the work. These methods of criticism are under the guidance and control of a conceptual system (a theory of literary criticism) and are not merely whimsical or subjective. Facts are studied, concepts analyzed, generalizations reached, and values affirmed. Conceptual methods are objective in the sense that disciplined agreement can be sought and approximated. Different critics may examine the same work using the same criteria and come to pretty much the same conclusion—a kind of learned consensus. This result is clearly seen when a group of scholars acknowledge that a definitive analysis of a work or body of literature has been achieved. Of course, in due time, or with different critics using a different procedure, the analysis and conclusions may be challenged or overthrown, but that is a mark of any field in which keen intellectual inquiry exists.

SOK Model (Part Three)
Products, Productions:

A field of study produces facts, concepts, conceptual systems, telling questions, methods of work, values—the list of elements contained in the structure of knowledge. Most people become familiar with the face of a discipline through its completed studies. Books and textbooks, monographs and essays, lectures and articles are the typical forms in which content is embedded. We find here selected facts, principled interpretations, extensive analyses, summaries and generalizations, conclusions and explanations.

We must be most careful not to commit the fallacy of misplaced concreteness and confuse inert ideas with knowledge. By including the term "productions" in this part of our model, we point to such events as plays, dramas, poetic readings, films and other works of art which take on a characteristic form when being produced. Our vision of human knowledge must extend beyond marks on a piece of paper, books in a library. It is probably not necessary to belabor this point or extend the discussion of

the products of a field, since much agreement exists about this aspect of structured knowledge.

SOK Model (Part Four)
Values:

Value as an aspect of knowledge is not so readily agreed to by the man-in-the-street. The heritage of a value-free positivistic epistemology in the sciences still lingers on. Even examples of the interplay between values and facts as exist in the scientist's honest reporting of facts do not seem to carry the conviction that values and facts ride in the same epistemological boat.

Values, to us, constitute both a separate category in the structure of knowledge and an aspect of each of the foregoing aspects of the model. Take the Context for Inquiry for example. The Scene and the basis by which the phenomena of interest emerge perhaps reflect a most fundamental ontological value orientation of the form: What knowledge is of most worth? The sense of approach and the telling question indicate a choice of a way into reality (whether fictional or not), and hence reflect a value judgment. The key concepts and conceptual systems represent values cleaned up a bit; that is, the values of precision of referent, clarity of meaning, coherence of thought come into play here. The values of method are well known. Method indicates procedure, system, reliability, objectivity.

For the products other values appear. Products have instrumental value (they are good for something else), intrinsic value (they are good in themselves), commercial value, esthetic value, moral value—a whole range.

We have found it useful sometimes to distinguish between within-the-field values (the beauty and elegance of a mathematical proof) and outside-the-field values (the value of mathematics for teaching engineers). Almost any field that is used as material for teaching has pedagogical value, an outside-the-field value. We believe it important for the workers in a field to identify, criticize and justify their values. Especially is it important to know those values which have a claim of intrinsic worth, for without some clearly identified intrinsic values, the field may become merely the hand-maiden to other fields, serving only instrumental values. When history is justified only by its instrumental value in creating patriotic citizens, it lays itself open to abandonment when other means are found equal or superior to achieving love of country. When English literature is justified

only on the grounds that it helps pupils understand themselves better, it may be replaced by the guidance counselor or psychotherapeutic encounter groups.

Values are deliberated interests. To identify values we must see what our likings are—not always an easy task. We must also relate our desires to the grounds for holding them, and this usually involves a principle of justification. Classic principles in academic life have been respect for persons and respect for evidence.

This structure of knowledge model is abstract and general, and it must be more completely filled in with concrete and specific materials from the field of English Education. We will now sketch what we call a SOK Module; that is, one way to view an aspect of English Education. We would expect others to be more knowledgeable here and would also expect the construction of a wide variety of SOK modules by workers in this field who must, after all, identify, develop, test and communicate knowledge.

SOK Module—English Education
The Context for Inquiry:

Although both the English scholar and the English teacher are interested in education, the English Educator, it seems to us, would take as the Scene the topics of Education: the teacher, the learner, the social order, the subject matter. The phenomena of interest would be the processes of education: the ways subject matters, societies, teachers and learners, interact. The English Educator cannot know well all the scholarship within the specialized fields of English—literature, criticism, philology, etc.—nor can he know well all the day-to-day complexities of educational practice which occupy the English teacher. Much mutual understanding and interest is shared between the English scholar and the English teacher—which the English Educator attempts to bring together into a disciplined field of study.

Some years ago at Cornell University we put together a monograph with the title *Literary Criticism and the Teaching of English.*[3] We leaned heavily upon M. H. Abrams' work, *The Mirror and the Lamp,* because it provided a synoptic set of terms and distinctions by which one can talk about theories of literary criticism.[4] The approach of Abrams is most suggestive. He uses historical methods and materials (the history of a discipline is

especially useful in understanding the structure of knowledge as paradigm in the first sense). Abrams also uses philosophical methods and ideas, being reflexively aware of what he is doing in aesthetics.

Abrams reviews the history of aesthetic theory and finds four elements present in "almost all theories which aim to be comprehensive": the work, the artist, and universe, and the audience. Let us quote Abrams:

> First, there is the *work*, the artistic product itself. And since this is a human product, an artifact, the second common element is the artificer, the *artist*. Third, the work is taken to have a subject which, directly or deviously, is derived from existing things—to be about, or signify, or reflect something which either is, or bears some relation to, an objective state of affairs. This third element, whether held to consist of people and actions, ideas and feelings, material things and events, or supersensible essences, has frequently been denoted by that word-of-all-work, 'nature'; but let us use the more neutral and comprehensive term, *universe*, instead. For the final element we have the *audience:* the listeners, spectators, or readers to whom the work is addressed, or to whose attention, at any rate, it becomes available.[5]

Most literary theories emphasize one of these elements and examine literature in accordance with the demand of that key element, although each of the other three elements has a place. Abrams labels the theories which focus on the universe as imitated or copied by the work as *mimetic*. The *pragmatic* theory takes the audience as a key element, appraising literature according to how effectively it instructs and/or delights. Those theories viewing literature as a medium through which the mind, heart, and personality of the author are revealed Abrams calls *expressive*. And the *objective* theory takes the work as the key element. These theories represent central tendencies, not exclusive categories. Abrams' schema has the virtues of simplicity and inclusiveness, a historical base, and philosophical concepts.

An example of the way a specialist in English Education can use theories central to his disciplines in order to structure conceptual and empirical research problems is the study being conducted by Joseph E. Strzepek at Stanford University. Strzepek starts from the assumption that rich sources of pedagogical cues for secondary teaching of English are the theories of literature and literary criticism. Such theories offer a variety of answers to the questions: What is literature? What are its functions? Why and how should it be studied? They include methods and

concepts for carrying on the study of literature especially useful to the secondary teacher. In summary, Strzepek's study is an attempt to analyze the pragmatic and objective theories of literary criticism, to illustrate how they can be adapted to the teaching of literature in the secondary schools, and to develop empirically testable hypotheses regarding the use of such adaptations. Let us look just briefly at suggestions for study that come out of an examination of one theory of criticism, the pragmatic.

For the pragmatic critic the scene is the audience. The artist is concerned with the effects he achieves with his work. The artist seems to be alertly listening for responses, testing reactions, noticing *what works.*

What kinds of telling questions does the pragmatic critic ask? According to Abrams:

> The central tendency of the pragmatic critic is to conceive a poem (N.B. the term poem is a shorthand designation of any work of literature) as something made in order to effect the requisite responses in its readers; to consider the author from the point of view of the powers and training he must have had in order to achieve this end; to ground the classification and anatomy of poems in large part on the special effects each kind and component is competent to achieve; and to derive the norms of the poetic art and canons of critical appraisal from the needs and legitimate demands of the audience to whom the poetry is addressed.[6]

Thus, telling questions are these: What kind and how profound are the responses which are elicited by a work? Has the audience been instructed or delighted in significant and desirable ways? To what extent are the author's rhetorical techniques successful in eliciting the intended responses?

As noted earlier, the principle of evidence is closely related to the telling question. The principle of evidence for the pragmatic critic seems to be derived from "the needs and legitimate demands of the audience." What counts as a work of art is determined by the audience, or more generally, the social order. Poems are classified and analyzed in terms of the special effects each kind and component is competent to achieve.

Key Concepts and Conceptual Systems:

The key element, as Abrams has outlined it, in each theory of literary criticism becomes a key concept. For the pragmatic theory, the key element is the audience, and thus unpacks into a

small set of key concepts. We have already seen in Abrams' view that the central tendency of the pragmatic critic is to think of a poem as shaping responses in the audience. Of the many different kinds of responses, the pragmatic critic is chiefly interested in two: edification and entertainment. These two concepts expand very quickly into a whole cluster of related concepts. Edification can become instruction, appreciation, explanation, understanding. The edification can be of matters as diverse as moral didacticism (a fool and his money are soon parted) or weather intelligence (red sky in the morning, sailors take warning . . .). The entertainment concept expands into concepts of comedy and humor, sensibility and common sense, subtle joy and slapstick;—in fact, the whole range of aesthetic response from ugly to beautiful to absurd (and beyond) can be discussed here. And the dialectical intertwinings of either edifying or entertaining or both edifying and entertaining keep critics writing criticism.

Concepts of educaton may be looked for in all theories of literary criticism. The pragmatic theory chosen as an example in this paper makes *teaching* one of the great purposes of poetry. Thus there is no serious difficulty in relating elements of English and Education which approximate an identity. The English Educator should test and extend these similarities by contrasting the pragmatic meaning of teaching (including the moral purpose) with the meaning of teaching found in the other approaches to criticism and in other theories of education. The concern with a range of alternative views of education should be a special interest of English Educators.

Some telling questions come from theories of education. Thus English Educators need to study classical humanism, modern experimentalism, existentialism as theories of education, as well as other educational theories. These theories will present different views about the nature of man (the learner, the teacher), the nature of the social order (the audience and its ideologies), the nature of knowledge (methods of inquiry and criteria of verification), the nature of value (aims, ends, and goals of education). These theories provide a rich source of evocative material about the Scene of Education. The telling questions suggested by these theories need to be analyzed conceptually and tested empirically. This is basic work of the English Educator.

An example of this kind of work comes from Strzepek's study. He notes a conflict in basic educational assumptions between the pragmatic and the objective modes of criticism. One educational view is that the objective approach to literature

should be reserved for older and/or college bound students.[7] The pragmatic approach is thought to be particularly appropriate for younger and/or "slower" students because it is more likely to motivate them by emphasizing the relevance of the content of literature to their own experiences. Another educational view, however, is that the objective approach is specially helpful for younger or slower students because it emphasizes structure which helps the student organize his knowledge of literature.

The first of these two competing assumptions is held by many English teachers (as the Squire and Applebee study of high school English programs revealed).[8] The second assumption can be traced to Bruner and the *Process of Education*, but it is also held by English educators (such as Squire and Applebee) who believe pupils must be taught to read critically, to understand what is being said in a work of literature, before they should be asked to relate it to their experiences. These competing assumptions need to be precisely analyzed, and the kinds of educational questions they support need to be tested both with the procedures of empirical science and the less rigorous but more practical procedures of English teachers in programs of instruction. It might be noted that, given varying kinds of teachers, students and literature, both the pragmatic and objective approaches may be effective: having competing assumptions does not necessarily imply a contradiction with one side true and the other false.

One general question is thus: In what ways does literature educate? William Carlos Williams noted that, "It is difficult to get news from poems, yet men die miserably every day for lack of what is found there." [9] Is this true? In what sense? What are the many relations between human experience and language, and the structured language of literature? Man learns language through experience and he experiences things through language, and orders experience with language. Language as a key feature of experience has many similarities to the educative process: both are alive, creative, growing, enlightening—as well as dead, stultifying, decaying, misleading. Both are universal and particular, extraordinary and ordinary, controlled and uncontrolled —perhaps the qualifiers could go on and on. Here surely are rich and distinctive phenomena of interest for the English Educator.

The poet, the artificer, condenses human experience through his works, and he expands experience as well. How does this happen? More, what is it, as I. A. Richards writes, that "attracts

the keenest minds in their brightest hours" to the study of poetry? What keeps alive the poetic tradition? How is the tradition transmitted and transformed? These are educational questions of a most telling sort.

Methods of Work:

One important idea needs to be made explicit at this point. Educational research has been characterized by a limitation to one procedural commitment: the experimental method of research, i.e., pre-test, post-test, experimental and control groups, and the use of statistical devices to determine the significance of results. Recently many researchers have become disenchanted with the results of research and some have begun to question the methods of research. It is our belief that a much broadened concern with method is called for. Such an analysis might begin with studies of past inquiries of whatever sort which seem to have been successful in illuminating and changing educational practice.

In general we believe that methods of conceptual research have not been well applied in education, including English Education. No handbook on such research methods is readily available, a sharp contrast to the large variety of books on empirical research techniques and methods in education. English Education has a rich resource of conceptual methods in the whole domain of literary criticism. We have indicated some ways these ideas might serve the English Educator and will not say much more here. The work of Richard McKeon in *Critics and Criticism* is an excellent example of the use of a philosophical method (he calls it "dialectical") to probe the conceptual base of art and criticism. R. S. Crane's views on what the so-called Chicago school of critics does in its work is also cogent.[10]

In the search for and analysis of methods of work, it is our suggestion that one should begin by looking at the immediate sources of strength which practitioners in any field already have. Rather than try to convert a bright student of English literature into a statistically-oriented psychologist, or an analytically-oriented philosopher, why not begin where the student is strongest and seek to discover *how* work in the student's field goes forward? What do scholars in English *do* when they work? What criteria of success are used? Writers and other artists are sometimes called craftsmen—what constitutes the craft, the way of working? Can procedures and techniques be taught to others? "How does a poem mean?" is a good question, and one that can

perhaps be generalized to other phenomena of interest in English Education.

Products, Productions:

Here we can be very brief. Any completed analysis of criticism would be an example of product. Abrams cites Samuel Johnson's *Preface to Shakespeare* as a monument of neo-classic criticism within the pragmatic frame of reference. Some good examples of pragmatic criticism can be found in Bernstein's *Teaching English in High School.*[11]

A Cornell student, Claire Wooster Davey, produced an essay which we think qualifies as a product in English Education. She took the four topics of education (pupil, subject matter, teacher, social order) as a framework for analyzing the older slow learner. She treated the contributions and deficiencies of prevalent points of view in each of these topics and then proposed educational practices for the below average pupil who will continue far enough to graduate from high school. Her proposals were tested in part by her own teaching practices.[12] There is an empirical study conducted by Alan Madsen.[13] Strzepek believes that the Madsen study is premature because Madsen does not clearly identify the concepts and methods of distinct theories of criticism. Strzepek's study attempts this identification, as well as developing a way to adapt these concepts and methods to the teaching of literature in high school. These four citations illustrate the wide range of products which we believe should be expected in English Education. The field of knowledge has multiple structures, not just one.

Hopefully, if this approach to knowledge-making in English Education is workable, the future will see many SOK modules constructed. This paper presents only an approach to complex terrain; more has been left out than included; no analysis has been given of linguistics, grammar, composition and other important areas in English. Likewise nothing has been said about other disciplined approaches to education—psychology, sociology, history.

Values:

Values are easily spotted. From the point of view of pragmatic literary criticism, the elements of entertainment and edi-

fication, the needs and legitimate demands of the audience, and so on, are significant values in the value saturated pragmatic theory. It should be clear that different theories of criticism represent different major values even when, as in the objective theory, value is less explicit than in the pragmatic theory. The choice of the key element and the ordering given the other elements represents a basic value choice, a priority ranking, and a mode of justification of values.

Educational values also come out of literature, as they come out of other aspects of subject matter. A teacher's judgment of a pupil may be directly influenced by the teacher's concept of human nature derived from the study of literature. Writers who seem to assert in their writing that human nature is dual, that man suffers from original sin, and so on, may influence teachers who read them to adopt these same views about pupils. Writers who write as if all art is propaganda—it selects to persuade to a point of view—may influence teachers to be skeptical about the value of knowledge. Writers who use their art to dramatize a social problem may influence teachers to use their classroom and the curriculum for purposes of political socialization. Readers of existentialist literature may be unable to see any value in standardized achievement tests or behaviorally-stated educational aims. These comments are obvious to many but so often overlooked by the empirical researcher that they must be reasserted.

If the concept of education is taken as basic for the English Educator, then the value aspects of education, educating, and the deliberate control and understanding over these phenomena will be primary values. It would seem that American society finds English valuable; it is perhaps among the best subsidized, if not best understood, elements in the curriculum. What a society honors will be taught in its schools, but not necessarily financed as a research project. Before English Education can become as well disciplined a field as it should be, more research money must be allocated in this area. In addition, a set of peculiar and dysfunctional constraints will need to be mitigated; snobbery, status-seeking, disdain for the grubby labor of understanding the educative process, withering sarcasm, and peevish pettiness often characterize the sniping between English scholars, educators and teachers. These constraints exist perhaps because disciplined knowledge does not exist in proportionate shares across domains. It is our conviction that disciplined inquiry can produce both theoretical and practical knowledge for the conduct of an educational practice that surely is one of man's most valuable experiences.

FOOTNOTES

[1]N. L. Gage, "This Side of Paradigms: The State of Research on Teaching English," Research Design and the Teaching of English: Proceedings of the San Francisco Conference, 1963. Chicago, Illinois: NCTE, 1964, pp. 22-31.

[2]Joseph J. Schwab, "The Concept of the Structure of a Discipline," The Educational Record, July 1962, pp. 197-205.

[3]D. B. Gowin, Sanford Schwartz, Joan A. Gordon, Michael L. Hays, and Margaret A. Ferranti, Literary Criticism and the Teaching of English. (Ithaca, New York: Inter-University Project One Series, 1965).

[4]M. H. Abrams, The Mirror and the Lamp. (New York: Norton, 1953).

[5]Abrams, op. cit., p. 5.

[6]Abrams, op cit., p. 15.

[7]Walter Loban, Margaret Ryan and James R. Squire. Teaching Language and Literature--Grades 7-12. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1961.

[8]James R. Squire and Roger K. Applebee. High School English Instruction Today. (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968).

[9]William Carlos Williams, The Desert Music and Other Poems. (New York: Random House, 1954).

[10]R. S. Crane, ed., Critics and Criticism. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 195).

[11]Abraham Bernstein, Teaching English in High School. (New York: Random House, 1961).

[12]Claire Wooster Davey, English for the Older Slow Learner, Inter-University Project One, Ithaca, New York, 1966. A limited supply of free copies of this document are available from 108 Stone Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York 14850.

[13]Alan L. Madsen, Responses of Prospective English Teachers to a Test on Theories of Literary Criticism. (Urbana, Illinois: ISCPET, 1968).

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY New York State English Council and authors TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."